



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,050	06/20/2003	Anthony M. Olson	P1946US00	8455
24133	7590	12/22/2008	EXAMINER	
GATEWAY, INC.			JONES, HEATHER RAE	
ATTN: Patent Attorney			ART UNIT	
610 GATEWAY DRIVE			PAPER NUMBER	
MAIL DROP Y-04			2621	
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			12/22/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,050

Applicant(s)

OLSON, ANTHONY M.

Examiner

HEATHER R. JONES

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/92)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 20, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne et al. (WO 92/22983) in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle (U.S. Patent 6,453,115) in view of Utsunomiya et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0066113).

Regarding claim 1, Browne et al. discloses a system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a PVR (100) having a first memory (104), a network interface device (105a), and logic configured to copy the television program P into memory (the controller (105) copies the television program P into memory); and a second memory (104b) in communication with the PVR (100) via the network interface device (105a) (Fig. 1; page 10, line 32 – page 11, line 11). Furthermore, Browne et al. discloses that the system keeps track of the total amount of “on-line” storage capacity (page 11, lines 3-11). However, Browne et al. fails to disclose a network communicatively connected to the network interface device; a personal computer connected to the network; and virtual storage management (VSM) logic configured to track the location of the second memory on the network, and to store a portion of the program P in the second memory; wherein the VSM logic is configured to track one or more logical addresses of the second memory on the network for storing a plurality of portions of the program P including the said portion.

Referring to the Salmonsens reference, Salmonsens discloses in Fig. 14 a system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a PVR (1400 multimedia receiver/recorder) having a first memory (1426), a network interface device (1410), and logic configured to copy the television program P into memory (1444 – remote storage); a network communicatively connected to said network interface device (paragraph [0183]); a personal computer connected to the network (remote storage/source can be a computer - paragraphs [0028] and

[0032]); and a second memory in communication with the PVR via the network interface device (remote storage 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have connected the PVR system to a network that is connected to extra storage as well as a computer as disclosed by Salmonsén in the system disclosed by Browne et al. in order to make the system more versatile and to provide more storage locations. However, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsén fail to disclose virtual storage management (VSM) logic configured to track the location of the second memory on the network, and to store a portion of the program P in the second memory; wherein the VSM logic is configured to track one or more logical addresses of the second memory on the network for storing a plurality of portions of the program P including the said portion.

Referring to the Boyle reference, Boyle discloses a system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a PVR having a first and second memory (col. 6, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 35-37 – the storage subsystem comprises a hard drive incorporating one or more magnetic disks); virtual storage management (VSM) logic configured to track the location of the second memory on the network, wherein the VSM logic is configured to track one or more logical addresses of the second memory for storing a plurality of portions of the program P (col. 6, lines 38-58; col. 10, lines 31-42; col. 13, lines 50-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the technique of using VSM logic as disclosed by Boyle with the logic that keeps track of the "on-line" storage capacity disclosed by Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in order to allow the system to know not only know the amount of available "on-line" storage capacity, but to also keep track of where portions of programs are recorded in order to allow the system to more efficiently implement trick play modes. However, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle fail to disclose storing a portion of the program P in the second memory.

Referring to the Utsunomiya et al. reference, Utsunomiya et al. discloses a recording system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a first memory (3), a network interface drive, and logic configured to copy the television program P into memory (control unit 10 copies the television program P into memory); a second memory (4) in communication with the recording system via the network interface device; and a virtual storage management (VSM) logic configured to track the location of the second memory (4) on the network, and to store a portion of the program P in the second memory (4) (Figs. 1 and 11; paragraphs [0083] – [0085]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of recording a portion of a program onto a different memory when the first memory is full and to use the virtual storage management logic to track all the portions of the program

as disclosed by Utsunomiya et al. with the PVR as described by Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in order to allow the PVR to use the memories to their fullest capabilities as well as to efficiently playback recordings when a portion of a program is recorded in the first memory and another portion of the program is recorded in the second memory.

Regarding claim **2**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the VSM logic is configured to track the total amount of memory storage on the network that is available for storing at least a portion of a program (Browne et al: Fig. 3 – auto recording storage allocation (305); page 20, line 38 – page 21, line 3; Utsunomiya et al.: paragraphs [0044] and [0047]).

Regarding claim **3**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the VSM logic is configured to track the memory locations of a plurality of portions P(i) of the program P (Boyle: col. 6, lines 38-58; col. 10, lines 31-42; col. 13, lines 50-58; Utsunomiya et al.: Fig. 11; paragraphs [0083]–[0085]).

Regarding claim **4**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the VSM logic is configured to perform at least one of: (a) track which memory devices on the network are currently active

in recording or playback; (b) track the memory locations of previously stored programs; (d) inform the user when a memory device holding at least a part of a program is off-line; (e) request the user to bring on-line a memory device that is off-line; (f) inform a user before the total available on-line memory runs out; (g) allow the user to set a memory lower limit for the VSM logic to inform the user prior to running out of memory; and (h) after informing the user of the memory lower limit condition, further provide the user the option to erase previously stored programs in real time (Boyle: col. 6, lines 38-58; col. 10, lines 31-42; Utsunomiya et al.: Fig. 11 – tracks the memory locations of previously stored programs).

Regarding claim 5, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as further comprising an archival memory device in communication with the PVR; and archival storage management (ASM) logic configured to store the program P on the archival memory device (Browne et al.: page 10, line 32 – page 11, line 11 – the optional storage section may include removable media for long term storage; Utsunomiya et al.: Figs. 1 and 4; paragraphs [0043] and [0083]-[0085]).

Regarding claim 6, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 5 including that the archival memory device comprises a DVD-R device (Browne et al.: page 10, line 32 – page 11, line 11 –

the optional storage section may include removable media for long term storage; Utsunomiya et al.: Figs. 1 and 4; paragraph [0043] – the disk (18) can be optical disk).

Regarding claim 7, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the first memory and the second memory each comprises a hard disk drive (Browne et al: page 10, line 32 – page 11, line 11; Utsunomiya et al.: paragraph [0043] – the disk (18) can be a hard disk).

Regarding claims 8-14, grounds for rejecting claims 1-7 and 20 apply for claims 8-14 in their entirety.

Regarding claims 15-18, these are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1, 2, 5, and 20. Therefore, claims 15-18 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 2, 5, and 20.

Regarding claim 19, Browne et al. discloses a method of playing back a program using a PVR, each memory device (104 and 104b) in communication with the PVR, at least one of the memory devices (104b) in communication with the PVR via a network (105a), the method comprising: playing back a program through at least the PVR (playing back a program that is stored in the first memory device (104)); and playing back a program through the network (105a) and through the PVR (playing back a program stored in the second memory (104b)) (Fig. 1; page 10, line 32 – page 11, line 11). However, Browne et al. fails to disclose playing back a program P, wherein the program is stored in at least

two portions, each portion is stored on a separate memory device and using VSM logic of the PVR to track locations of each of the portions stored on the separate memory devices, the locations including one or more logical addresses on each of the separate memory devices as well as the network being connected to a personal computer.

Referring to the Salmonsens reference, Salmonsens discloses in Fig. 14 a system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a PVR (1400 multimedia receiver/recorder) having a first memory (1426), a network interface device (1410), and logic configured to copy the television program P into memory (1444 – remote storage); a network communicatively connected to said network interface device (paragraph [0183]); a personal computer connected to the network (remote storage/source can be a computer - paragraphs [0028] and [0032]); and a second memory in communication with the PVR via the network interface device (remote storage 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have connected the PVR system to a network that is connected to extra storage as well as a computer as disclosed by Salmonsens in the system disclosed by Browne et al. in order to make the system more versatile and to provide more storage locations. However, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens fail to disclose playing back a program P, wherein the program is stored in at least two portions, each portion is stored on a separate memory device and using VSM logic of the PVR to track locations of each of the

portions stored on the separate memory devices, the locations including one or more logical addresses on each of the separate memory devices.

Referring to the Boyle reference, Boyle discloses a system useful for storing a television program P, comprising: a PVR having a first and second memory (col. 6, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 35-37 – the storage subsystem comprises a hard drive incorporating one or more magnetic disks); virtual storage management (VSM) logic configured to track the location of the second memory on the network, wherein the VSM logic is configured to track one or more logical addresses of the second memory for storing a plurality of portions of the program P (col. 6, lines 38-58; col. 10, lines 31-42; col. 13, lines 50-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the technique of using VSM logic as disclosed by Boyle with the logic that keeps track of the "on-line" storage capacity disclosed by Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in order to allow the system to know not only know the amount of available "on-line" storage capacity, but to also keep track of where portions of programs are recorded in order to allow the system to more efficiently implement trick play modes. However, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle fail to disclose storing a portion of the program P in the second memory.

Referring to the Utsunomiya et al. reference, Utsunomiya et al. discloses a method of playing back a program P, the program stored in at least two portions, each portion stored on a separate memory device, the memory comprising:

playing back a first portion; and playing back a second portion through the network (Figs. 1, 11, and 12; paragraphs [0083] – [0085]). Furthermore, Utsunomiya et al. discloses using VSM logic of the PVR to track locations of each of the portions stored on the separate memory devices (Figs. 1 and 11; paragraphs [0083] – [0086] and [0098]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of recording a portion of a program onto a different memory when the first memory is full and to use the virtual storage management logic to track all the portions of the program as disclosed by Utsunomiya et al. with the PVR as described by Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in order to allow the PVR to use the memories to their fullest capabilities as well as to efficiently playback recordings when a portion of a program is recorded in the first memory and another portion of the program is recorded in the second memory.

Regarding claim **20**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the VSM logic is configured as part of the PVR (Boyle: Fig. 1; col. 6, lines 38-58; Utsunomiya et al.: paragraphs [0086] and [0098]).

Regarding claim **25**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the PVR is connected to the personal

computer via said network (Salmonsens: remote storage/source can be a computer - paragraphs [0028], [0032], and [0183]).

Regarding claim **26**, grounds for rejecting claim 25 applies for claim 26 in its entirety.

Regarding claim **27**, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 25. Therefore, claim 27 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 25.

Regarding claim **28**, grounds for rejecting claim 27 applies for claim 28 in its entirety.

5. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. as applied to claims 1, 8, and 15 above, and further in view of Perinpanathan (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0083145).

Regarding claim **21**, Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose the system further comprising: wherein, upon detecting the second memory is off-line, the VSM logic is configured to provide an instruction to bring the second memory back on-line.

Referring to the Perinpanathan reference, Perinpanathan discloses a system further comprising: wherein, upon detecting the second memory is off-line, the VSM logic is configured to provide an instruction to bring the second

memory back on-line (paragraph [0007] – the device may go back on-line as a result of a user's selection or instruction).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided instructions for bringing a device back on-line as disclosed by Perinpanathan with the system disclosed by Browne et al. in view of Salmonsens in view of Boyle in view of Utsunomiya et al. in order for the data stored on that device to be available to the user.

Regarding claim **22**, grounds for rejecting claim 21 applies for claim 22 in its entirety.

Regarding claims **23** and **24**, these are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 21 and 22. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 21 and 22.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Barton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0095791).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEATHER R. JONES whose telephone number is (571)272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
December 17, 2008

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621